



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,898	03/17/2004	Guillaume Delarue	5974-156	4620
27383	7590	12/03/2007		
CLIFFORD CHANCE US LLP 31 WEST 52ND STREET NEW YORK, NY 10019-6131			EXAMINER LE, DEBBIE M	
			ART UNIT 2168	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/03/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/802,898

Applicant(s)

DELARUE, GUILLAUME

Examiner

DEBBIE M. LE

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments filed on October 1, 2007. Claim 1 is amended and claims 12-13 are cancelled. Thus, claims 1-11 are pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho et al (US Patent 6,964,053 B2) in view of Wachtel (US Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0194181 A1).

As per claim 1, Ho discloses [a] computer system for allowing at least two client processes (Fig. 1, col. 10, lines 35-40) to access data through a server process (col. 10, lines 31-33, as common application metamodel (CAM), said server process comprising an application and an engine (Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 44-46, as CAM consists of language metamodels (application) and application domain interface metamodel (an engine),

wherein the engine is adapted to receive requests (col. 11, lines 35-40, as these application interface are access points to the applications through which all input and

output are connected, these interface are in terms of application interface metamodels) in a first language from one of client processes and issuing responses in the first language to said one of client processes (col. 4, lines 5-9, as initiating the transaction on the end user application in a first language to the server), and

the engine is adapted to communicate with the application in a second language distinct from the first language (col. 4, lines 10-14, as converting the transaction to an application written in a different language running on the application server), the second language being an object-oriented language with objects having properties and associated with events (Fig. 4, as Cobol metamodel, C metamodel, col. 4, lines 20-21, col. 10, line 53, col. 14, lines 45-53); and

wherein the engine is adapted to issue responses in the first language to said one of client processes according to the objects instantiated by the application and to their properties (col. 13, lines 21-42, as populate the data into the original format as previous output form generated by the user, transmitting the transaction output data to the user); and

the engine is adapted to provide updated properties and events to the application in the second language according to requests received in the first language from said one of client processes (col. 15, lines 44-58, as additional language models are added to CAM).

Ho does not explicitly teach, (but Wachtel does teach) an application managing said data and the application is adapted to instantiate objects, to evaluate properties of instantiated objects based on data and to react to events, in response to said engine

communicating with said application (para. 0046). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references to includes an application manages data and to instantiate objects, to evaluate properties of instantiated objects based on data and to react to events as disclosed by Wachtel because the intelligent data assimilation system provides extensibility, free to change without inhibiting another data provider's ontology. Thus, it would enable a high degree of reusability of a Web server's components to fulfill a service requests from different types of data clients.

As per claim 2, Ho further teaches the engine is further adapted to receive requests in the first language from another client process and issue responses in the first language to said another client process; the engine is adapted to issue responses in the first language to said another client process according to the objects instantiated by the application and to their properties; and the engine is adapted to provide updated properties and events to the application in the second language according to requests received in the first language from said another client process (Fig. 1, different client computer platform and applications such as JAVA, C, C++, HTML, XML, Dynamic HTML, WML is transmitted to the server, and these limitations have been rejected by the same reasons has provided above in the detailed rejected of claim 1).

As per claim 3, Ho further teaches wherein a client process communicates with the engine of the server process through an application process, said application process comprising: a second engine adapted to communicate with the client process; a second application adapted to communicate with the second engine;

and a client interface adapted to communicate with the engine in the first language and adapted to communicate with the second application and/or with the second engine (Fig. 4, application interface metamodels, such as Cobol metamodel, C metamodel).

As per claim 4, Ho further teaches wherein the engine is further adapted to receive requests in a third language from another client process and issue responses in the third language to said another client process, the third language being different from the first language and distinct from the second language; the engine is adapted to issue responses in the third language to said another client process according to the objects instantiated by the application and to their properties; and the engine is adapted to provide updated properties and events to the application in the second language according to requests received in the third language from said another client process (Fig. 1, different client computer platform and applications such as JAVA, C, C++, HTML, XML, Dynamic HTML, WML is transmitted to the server, and these limitations have been rejected by the same reasons has provided above in the detailed rejected of claim 1).

As per claim 5, Ho further teaches wherein the engine is provided with a first renderer for communicating with said client process in said first language and with a second renderer for communicating with said another client process in said third language (Fig. 8, col. 8, lines 20-27, col. 10, lines 5-8, col. 12, lines 33-39).

As per claim 6, Ho further teaches wherein a client process communicates with the engine of the server process through an application process, said application

process comprising: a second engine adapted to communicate with the client process;
a second application adapted to communicate with the second engine;
and a client interface adapted to communicate with the engine in the first language and adapted to communicate with the second application and/or with the second engine (Fig. 4, application interface metamodels, such as Cobol metamodel, C metamodel).

As per claim 7, Ho further teaches wherein the engine is further adapted to receive requests in a third language from another client process and issue responses in the third language to said another client process, the third language being different from the first language and distinct from the second language; the engine is adapted to issue responses in the third language to said another client process according to the objects instantiated by the application and to their properties; the engine is adapted to provide updated properties and events to the application in the second language according to requests received in the third language from said another client process (Fig. 8, col. 8, lines 20-27, col. 10, lines 5-8, col. 12, lines 33-39, Fig. 1, different client computer platform and applications such as JAVA, C, C++, HTML, XML, Dynamic HTML, WML).

As per claim 8, Ho further teaches wherein the engine is provided with a first renderer for communicating with said client process in said first language and with a second renderer for communicating with said another client process in said third language (Fig. 8, col. 8, lines 20-27, col. 10, lines 5-8, col. 12, lines 33-39, Fig. 1, different client computer platforms and applications).

As per claim 9, Ho further teaches wherein a client process communicates with the engine of the server process through an application process, said application

process comprising: a second engine adapted to communicate with the client process; a second application adapted to communicate with the second engine; and a client interface adapted to communicate with the engine in the first language and also adapted to communicate with the second application and or with the second engine (Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 44-46, as CAM consists of language metamodels).

As per claim 10, Ho further teaches wherein a client process communicates with the engine of the server process through an application process, said application process comprising: a second engine adapted to communicate with the client process; a second application adapted to communicate with the second engine; and a client interface adapted to communicate with the engine in the first language and adapted to communicate with the second application and/or with the second engine (Fig. 4, different Application Interface Metamodels, C metamodel, Cobol metamodel).

As per claim 11, Ho further teaches wherein the first language includes html (col. 4, lines 15-19, as JAVA, C, C++, HTML, XML, Dynamic HTML, WML).

Response to Arguments

The rejection to 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph is removed.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 filed on October 1, 2007 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBBIE M. LE whose telephone number is (571) 272-4111. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/802,898
Art Unit: 2168

Page 9

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



DEBBIE LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

11/30/07